

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 794

UD 018 433

TITLE Interim Report of Findings on the Integration and Focus of Basic Skills Targeted Resources of Urban Districts.

INSTITUTION Central New Jersey Urban Schools Improvement Council.

PUB DATE 22 Nov 77

NOTE 46p.; Parts may be marginally legible due to print quality of the original document; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Basic Skills; *Compensatory Education Programs; Cost Effectiveness; Elementary Secondary Education; Program Coordination; *Program Evaluation; *Resource Allocations; *School Districts; Surveys; Urban Education; *Urban Schools

IDENTIFIERS *New Jersey

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this report is to examine the need for integration of various basic skills resources. The report concentrates on the comparison of data in the areas of policy, program integration, attitude and planning, student achievement, and cost effectiveness of the categorically-funded programs. Federal and local studies on compensatory education programs and basic skills programs for urban schools were utilized in compiling the document. Also considered were evaluation reports from urban New Jersey school districts, and survey forms administered to school administrators, board of education members, and instructional staff members. Similarities and differences between the survey data and other studies are pointed out. Directions which other urban districts may take in order to integrate targeted resources are indicated. Appended to the report are individual district profiles of basic skills and compensatory education program implementation, the board members and instructional staff survey forms, and suggestions for improving program effectiveness. (Author/GC)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED156794

CENTRAL NEW JERSEY URBAN SCHOOLS IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTERIM REPORT OF FINDINGS

ON THE INTEGRATION AND FOCUS OF BASIC SKILLS TARGETED
RESOURCES OF URBAN DISTRICTS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Eileen J. Smith, Central
N.J. Urban Schools

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD018433

C.N.J.U.S.I.C.
EILEEN J. SMITH, DIRECTOR
NOVEMBER 22, 1977

CENTRAL NEW JERSEY URBAN SCHOOLS IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL

EXTRACT

Title: Interim Report of Findings - On the Integration and Focus of Basic Skills Targeted Resources of Urban Districts

The purpose of the Interim Report of Findings is to examine the need for integration of the various targeted Basic Skills resources.

In pursuing its goals, the Central New Jersey Urban Schools Improvement Council has - since May 1977 - focused on the question and challenge of integrating the existing targeted resources.

This report concentrates on the comparison of data in the areas of policy, program integration, attitude and planning, student achievement and cost effectiveness of the categorically-funded program. It is the first report of findings and will be followed by position papers and alternative models developed by the Council as it searches for the best possible means of delivering quality educational services to the urban student.

#

CENTRAL NEW JERSEY URBAN SCHOOLS IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL

ASBURY PARK

Kenneth M. Benus - Assistant Superintendent

LAKEWOOD

Edgar Sherman - Assistant Superintendent

LONG BRANCH

Herbert A. Korey - Assistant Superintendent

NEPTUNE

William Moore - Coordinator of T & E

NEW BRUNSWICK

Stephen Farkas - Central Office

PERTH AMBOY

Edith R. Krahe - Assistant Superintendent

TRENTON

Pasquale A. Maffei - Assistant Superintendent

URBAN RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT
INSTITUTE

Joel Bloom

EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT
CENTER - Central

Robert W. Ward - Asst. Executive Director

C.N.J.U.S.I.C. - PROJECT

Eileen J. Smith - Project Coordinator

GOAL

The Central New Jersey Urban Schools Improvement Council has established as one of its goals a basic research effort which will offer alternative models for legally integrating basic skills targeted resources to most effectively meet student needs and efficient cost considerations. In May, 1977, the initial pursuit of this goal produced a profile of six of the seven participating districts as preliminary data concerning the number and level of schools within the district, numbers of students and staff and percentages of minimum skills students as well as the various applications of the basic skills resources. This information is attached in Appendix A.

OVERVIEW

After deliberating on five possible strategies for accomplishing this goal, the Council chose to subcontract in a limited fashion with consultants on a per diem basis. These consultants were to have assisted and worked in conjunction with the Project Director in collecting, organizing and synthesizing the available data and in presenting possible models for integrating the targeted resources in response to that data and the initial goal.

Resources used in compiling this preliminary report were: The Report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States (G.A.O. Report) on Assessment of Reading Activities Funded Under the Federal Program of Aid for Educationally Deprived Children (1975); the N.I.E. Report on the Administration of Compensatory Education (1977); the Five-Year

Examination of Compensatory Reading supervised by Educational Testing Service (ETS) (1977); the U. S. Office of Education Study of Educational Opportunities for Minority Students (1966); the Report by the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia on Factors Affecting Learning in that city's schools (1975); the Evaluation Reports from the local districts which comprise the consortium of the Central New Jersey Urban Schools Improvement Council; and Survey Forms to three populations within those districts: School Administrators, Board of Education Members, and Instructional Staff Members.

LIMITATIONS

These surveys were designed and the data collected within certain limitations. (Copies of the Survey instruments used are attached in Appendix B.) Those limitations place this interim report of the findings in the appropriate perspective. In the data collection, there are obvious natural limitations within the group interview structure of which we were not unaware. It is also important to note the lack of standardization among LEA program evaluations, the lack of participation on the part of the Board of Education Members in responding to the Surveys, and that the data collected from these sources is sufficient, but in no way complete. (See Appendix C for numerical documentation of responses.)

STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY

The foci of the Surveys (of the three populations) were: Policy, Program Integration, Attitude and Planning, Student Achievement and Cost Effectiveness of the Categorically-Funded Programs. The method of collection varied across the populations from a mailing to Board Members, facilitated by the New Jersey School Boards Association, to group interviews with administrators, program directors, and teachers.

This interim report, then, is designed to highlight the comparison and contrasting differences between the aforementioned studies and survey data and to indicate directions in which the Council Members and other urban school districts might move in order to better integrate the various targeted resources.

Certain implications can be drawn from this report as to the need for models applicable to administration, program integration, communication and instruction within categorically-funded programs. These implications are stated with the intention of involving the Council in the development of highly-focused models responsive to their individual and collective needs.

The following matrix illustrates the resources cited in relation to the categories projected for this study.

RELEASE MATTER

POLICY ...

as it relates to the clarity of regulations and guidelines.

E.L.E.

Lack of clarity in interpretations & guidelines issued under Title I; inconsistencies in Federal monitoring & enforcement.

E.A.C.

E.T.S.

Local Surveys

31% of Board of Ed. replies cite lack of clarity while 85% of administrators indicate lack of clarity particularly in the area of SCE.

Philadelphia Report

LEA Evaluations Title I 1975-1977

PROGRAM INTEGRATION ...

with specific reference to Title I, Title VII Bilingual & Comp. Ed.

In general, services delivered thru State Comp. Ed. programs are similar to those funded under Title I.

Board, Administrators, Instructional Staff split 40% to 50% on duplication of services.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT ...

Not reading at national norm level; not retaining gains.

The proportion of students one or more years below grade level receiving Comp. Ed. Reading Instruction is significantly higher in Title I than in other programs.

75% of surveys indicate positive student achievement & attainment of project objectives.

Positive student achievement & attainment of program objectives.

COST DIFFERENCES ...

Title I directors report that LEA's need funds for a wide range of purposes only one of which is serving educationally disadvantaged children.

Differences between the cost of similar services in Title I & non-Title I programs were not significant.

61.1% of Board of Ed. Members see programs cost effective. 49% of instructional staff believe that money expended = increased achievement.

Ineffective unless funds are targeted for specific purposes, i.e., Comp. Ed.

MANAGEMENT ...

The degree of personal interaction between State Title I officials & local district personnel appears to be strongly related to the general quality of local district administration. Inconsistencies in Federal management: conflict within OE has serious implications for the implementation of Title I because it threatens to paralyze Federal efforts to enforce compliance.

O.E. needs to improve its management to provide greater accountability to the public, to Congress and to improve program effectiveness.

100% Board of Ed. do not believe in a need for directors of separate programs; 85% opted for a single director of funded programs; 81% of administrators see need for program directors.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings in this interim report provide implications, at least, of the areas in which models alternative to the present system might be appropriately applied.

In the area of policy, the local perceptions especially on the part of Administrators regarding the clarity and consistency of guidelines particularly in the area of State Compensatory Education corroborate the N.I.E. findings regarding both federal and state policy and its inconsistent communication. While the New Jersey State Department of Education is making constant efforts to consolidate and model policies after those which are presently most effective, a position paper strongly presenting the Council's administrative concerns in which recommendations would incorporate not only the area of policy, but the implications this has for program integration and budgeting, is an apparent direction.

Questions to be addressed in this position paper might be:

How can an LEA exercise that flexibility provided for in the Federal framework in light of certain restrictive requirements of the State? "The Survey of Legal Standards defined a restrictive requirement as one that, though consistent with the Title I statute and legislative history, placed burdens on LEA's that were not necessary to accomplish the stated policy, and thus impeded the potential development of sound and innovative programs." (NIE)

If, for example, the LEA's option to place their remedial and corrective program at any level is in conflict with the State's decision to restrict such a program to a particular grade level span, which interpretation, State or Federal, takes precedence?

A second question raised is: Would the categorical programs have

greater effectiveness and operating efficiency if greater flexibility were exercised in program design?

In these issues as in others in the area of a policy question raised by the LEA's on interpretation, there are presently many unwritten answers (NIE Report). The final question then is: Where there is a critical question of interpretation, which supersedes, the State or Federal clarification?

The next area of concern is that of program integration which developmentally should be examined and addressed from two points raised under policy considerations: clarity and flexibility. The NIE Report claims that particularly in the case of pull-out vs. mainstream programs a lack of clarity and insufficient guidance to SEA's has resulted from OE's failure to disseminate practical guides about how to design a variety of programs within the legal framework.

Points to be addressed within a model of program integration based on existent Federal framework and the policy clarification required are:

1. The needs assessment process for identifying those populations who will receive the targeted resources of Title I, Title VII, Bilingual, and Compensatory Education and the qualifications for inclusion in separate programs; and how will the proposed uniform evaluation and assessment relate to urban needs?

2. The conflict situation which seems to arise from pull-out type programs, and constant movement of students which interferes with the instruction of the regular Board of Education teachers who in the end have responsibility for the full development of the student as well as monitoring

and reporting student progress or lack of it.

3. Since Compensatory Education, in particular, is so closely modeled on the Title I format, duplication becomes inevitable. The Council at this point might look at those options which exist within the legal, Federal framework for the execution of Title I as models for developing Compensatory Education so as to remove all questions of supplanting and duplication.

"Finally, there is no evidence that the design of State and Title I services is markedly different. State funds are most often used to complement and augment Title I programs rather than to establish distinct approaches." (NIE)

A third area worthy of exploration and demanding an alternative model appears to be that of management. In this area the most apparent need/solution to be drawn from the surveys of the local populations is that of a communications model. The question of why management has some difficulty in operating a total school program in relation to all guidelines: Federal vs. State vs. Local Board of Education. The NIE Report seems to support the local surveys and suggests that where LEA's experience difficulty is in relation to the whole communication chain as legislation goes through the various channels which attempt to make the laws workable. The lack of current updates in such documents as the program guides open the interpretation question again and may well be looked at in area #1 on policy as well as here because of the causal relationship. It is most often at the point of program implementation that management at the LEA goes into a conflict situation.

The present communication vehicle of the Central New Jersey Urban Schools Improvement Council presents itself as a viable and replicable model for communication within (program directors, Board of Education teachers, Title teachers, etc.) and among its member districts. Using the Survey data

from the Boards of Education Members, Administrators and Instructional Staff as an initial needs assessment, questions of conflict of local interpretation, student placement, program management, to name just a few, could be resolved at first by the three populations surveyed as a pilot effort.

Finally, an instructional integration model to deal with those concerns expressed as blocks to the effectiveness of categorical programs within the Surveys seems advisable. An instructional model such as the program improvement process as is now being piloted by basic skills teaching staffs of the Central New Jersey Urban Schools Improvement Council might be expanded to consider solutions to closing the gap between the real and the ideal situation in the areas of: Integration of special programs with the regular school program; classroom teacher understanding of the complex demands of categorical programs, or support and involvement of building principals.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study, conducted from August 1977 to November 1977, presents an initial thrust for the Council's serious consideration. It appears that certain models or alternatives in the areas of:

Policy

Program Integration

Management/Communication and

Instruction

have surfaced as worthy of further attention. It is incumbent upon the Council at this point to choose the direction it wishes to pursue in this study. If the efforts of this interim report of findings seem worthy of their recognition and pursuit, an obvious course of action can be determined by answering the following questions:

1. In light of the foregoing interim report of findings and the Council's commitment to Compensatory Education research and development, should the Council pursue Goal III to its conclusion?

"GOAL III: The Central Jersey Urban Consortium will have alternative models for legally integrating basic skills targeted resources to most effectively meet student needs, and efficient cost considerations."

2. What direction can the Council give to the Project Director concerning the completion of this goal?
3. How best can this be accomplished?

APPENDIX A

Central N.J. Urban Schools Improvement Council

Goal III.

"The Central Jersey Urban consortium will have alternative models for legally integrating basic skills targeted resources to most effectively meet student needs and efficient cost considerations."

- a. By April 22, each district will have identified and submitted to the steering committee the policies, procedures, programs, and alternative methods being used to integrate and focus its basic skills resources (e.g., regular programs, Title I, Compensatory Education, Title VII).

PROFILE OF DISTRICT

<u>Asbury Park</u>		<u>District</u>													
Number and Level of Schools	K-4	3													
	5-8	1													
	9-12	1													
Number of Students	3993	Number of Teachers	223												
% of Minimum Skills Students	The letter R indicates reading; M, mathematics. The percentages which follow indicate how many of the pupils tested in the district passed. Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest number.														
<u>Basic Skills Resources</u>															
Title I	District Asbury Park	MONMOUTH COUNTY <table border="0"> <tr> <td></td> <td>4th</td> <td>7th</td> <td>10th</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R</td> <td>64</td> <td>50</td> <td>45</td> </tr> <tr> <td>M</td> <td>27</td> <td>26</td> <td>44</td> </tr> </table>			4th	7th	10th	R	64	50	45	M	27	26	44
	4th	7th	10th												
R	64	50	45												
M	27	26	44												
Applied to Grade Levels	Pre-S to Grade 8														
Programs	Pre-School; Learning Resource														
	Centers														
Number of Personnel	13														
Other	--														

Compensatory Ed

Applied to Grade Levels 1-8

Programs Comprehensive Skills

Remediation

Number of Personnel 12

Other --

Title VII

Applied to Grade Levels N/A

Programs _____

Number of Personnel _____

Other _____

Other

Applied To Grade Levels N/A

Programs _____

Number of Personnel _____

Other _____

Central N.J. Urban Schools Improvement Council

Goal III.

"The Central Jersey Urban consortium will have alternative models for legally integrating basic skills targeted resources to most effectively meet student needs and efficient cost considerations."

- a. By April 22, each district will have identified and submitted to the steering committee the policies, procedures, programs, and alternative methods being used to integrate and focus its basic skills resources (e.g., regular programs, Title I, Compensatory Education, Title VII).

PROFILE OF DISTRICT

	Lakewood Schools	District
Number and Level of Schools	3 (K-4) Schools	
	1 (5 & 6) School	
	1 (6-8) Middle School	
	1 (9-12) High School	
Number of Students	5789	Number of Teachers 335
	45% Math	
% of Minimum Skills Students	36% Reading	

Basic Skills Resources

Title I

Applied to Grade Levels K-5

Programs K Readiness Project

1-5 Math

1-4 Reading

Number of Personnel 33

Other _____

Compensatory Ed

Applied to Grade Levels 4-7-10

Programs Individual Programs in Current Programs

Reading Programs

Title I - Grades K-5

Number of Personnel 12

Other _____

Title VII

Applied to Grade Levels _____

Programs NONE

Number of Personnel _____

Other _____

Other

Applied To Grade Levels _____

Programs NONE

Number of Personnel _____

Other _____

Central N.J. Urban Schools Improvement Council

Goal III.

- "The Central Jersey Urban consortium will have alternative models for legally integrated basic skills targeted resources to most effectively meet student needs and efficient cost considerations."

- a. By April 22, each district will have identified and submitted to the steering committee the policies, procedures, programs, and alternative methods being used to integrate and focus its basic skills resources (e.g., regular programs, Title I, Compensatory Education, Title VII).

PROFILE OF DISTRICT

NEPTUNE TOWNSHIP

District

Number and Level of Schools (6) K-4 Elementary
(2) 5-6 Middle
(1) 7, 8, 9 Junior High School
(1) 10, 11, 12 Senior High School

Number of students 6,205 Number of Teachers 346 (Regular Classroom)

% of Minimum Skills Students

Basic Skills Resources (Gr.4) R. 12%, M 41% (Gr.7) R. 35% M 54%
(Gr. 12) R 23% M 43%

Title I

Applied to Grade Levels Pre K - 4

Programs Pre K - K

1-4 Language Experience

4 Computational Skills

Number of Personnel 1 Coordinator

Other 17 Teachers

5 Aides

Compensatory Ed

Applied to Grade Levels 5-10

Programs 5-10 Remedial Reading

7,10 Remedial Mathematics

Number of Personnel 1 Coordinator

Other 3 Teacher/Programmers

9 Teachers

4 Assistants

Title VII

Applied to Grade Levels K-12

Program E.S.L.

Number of Personnel 1 Assistant

Other 1 Teacher/Programmer
(Recommendation Pending)

Other

Applied to Grade Levels _____

Programs _____

Number of Personnel _____

Other _____

Central N.J. Urban Schools Improvement Council

Goal III.

"The Central Jersey Urban consortium will have alternative models for legally integrating basic skills targeted resources to most effectively meet student needs and efficient cost considerations."

- a. By April 22, each district will have identified and submitted to the steering committee the policies, procedures, programs, and alternative methods being used to integrate and focus its basic skills resources (e.g., regular programs, Title I, Compensatory Education, Title VII).

PROFILE OF DISTRICT

New Brunswick

District

Number and Level of Schools

7 ~~Pre-K~~ - 2	4
1 Int. Schl	5-6
1 Jr. H.S.	7-8
1 High Schl	9-12

1 - Emotionally Disturbed
1 - School-Age Parents
1 - Alternative H.S. (9-12)

Number of Students 5208

Number of Teachers 330

(20%) % of Minimum Skills Students

Grades	Reading	Math
4	30%	56%
7	63%	65%
10	40%	52%

Basic Skills Resources

Title I

Applied to Grade Levels 1-6

Programs Language Experience
Computational Skills
Non-Standard English

Number of Personnel 24

Other Parent Resource Center

Compensatory Ed

Applied to Grade Levels 1-12

Programs math Labs
Remedial Reading Labs
Special Services

Number of Personnel 10+ *

Other *this year's program is the result of
a complex approval process due to special
problems.

Title VII (Bi-Lingual)

Applied to Grade Levels K-5

Programs Better Communication: A Bilingual-Bicultural
model

Number of Personnel 6

Other 27 classroom teachers involved - salaried
by board of Ed.

Other Title VII - ESAA

Applied To Grade Levels 5-12

Programs Resource Rooms focusing on improving
teacher skills in reading / math

Number of Personnel 5

Other _____

Compensatory Ed

Applied to Grade Levels K - 12

Programs Communication Skills

Computation Skills

Number of Personnel 17

Other

Title VII (Bilingual ESEA)

Applied to Grade Levels All

Programs Basic Programs { Curriculum
 Accountability
 Community - Resource Center
Teacher Training Component

Number of Personnel 10

K - 12

Other Bilingual Classes in which the
chief language of instruction
is Spanish.

Number of Personnel: 12 Teachers

Other - Title VII ESAA

Applied To Grade Levels Elementary

Programs Remedial Reading

Math Supplemental

Saturday Enrichment Program

Inter-School Teaming Activities

Number of Personnel 12

Other

Central N.J. Urban Schools Improvement Council

Goal III.

"The Central Jersey Urban consortium will have alternative models for legally integrating basic skills targeted resources to most effectively meet student needs and efficient cost considerations."

- a. By April 22, each district will have identified and submitted to the steering committee the policies, procedures, programs, and alternative methods being used to integrate and focus its basic skills resources (e.g., regular programs, Title I, Compensatory Education, Title VII).

PROFILE OF DISTRICT

<u>Perth Amboy</u>		<u>District</u>		
Number and Level of Schools	<u>1 - High School 9-12</u>			
	<u>2 - Middle Schools 5 - 8</u>			
	<u>8 - Elementary K - 4</u>			
	<u>1 - Adult Accredited H.S.</u>			
Number of Students	<u>6176</u>	Number of Teachers		<u>365</u>
% of Minimum Skills Students		<u>Grades</u>	<u>Reading</u>	<u>Math</u>
		4	27.5	52.9
		7	60.6	67.6
Basic Skills Resources		10	39.5	36.9

Title I

Applied to Grade Levels K - 6

Programs Reading

Non Standard English

Number of Personnel 21 1/2 Teachers
9 1/2 Support Staff

Other _____

Compensatory Ed

Applied to Grade Levels 1 - 8 and also 10th

Programs Communication Skills

Computation Skills

Number of Personnel 18 Teachers

Other 2½ Support Staff

Title VII

Applied to Grade Levels 5 - 9

Programs Program of Bilingual Education

(All major content areas taught in Spanish)

Number of Personnel 10 Teachers

Other 10 Support Staff

Other - Board of Ed. Bilingual Program

Applied To Grade Levels K - 4

Programs Bilingual Classes in which the chief
language of instruction is Spanish.

Number of Personnel 14 Teachers

Other _____

Goal III.

"The Central Jersey Urban consortium will have alternative models for legally integrating basic skills targeted resources to most effectively meet student needs and efficient cost considerations."

- a. By April 22, each district will have identified and submitted to the steering committee the policies, procedures, programs, and alternative methods being used to integrate and focus its basic skills resources (e.g., regular programs, Title I, Compensatory Education, Title VII).

PROFILE OF DISTRICT

	Trenton		District
Number and Level of Schools	17	K-6	
	5	7-9	
	1	10-12	

Number of Students 16,900 Number of Teachers 1,010

% of Minimum Skills Students 60%

Basic Skills Resources

Title I

Applied to Grade Levels PreK-6

Programs Language Arts

PreK - K

Non-Standard English

Number of Personnel 160

Other _____

Compensatory Ed

Applied to Grade Levels K-12

Programs Communication Skills

Computational Skills

Number of Personnel 75

Other _____

Title VII

Applied to Grade Levels 7-12

Programs Bilingual Education

Number of Personnel 16

Other _____

Other

Applied To Grade Levels _____

Programs _____

Number of Personnel _____

Other _____

Other - Board of Ed. ESL Program

Applied to Grade Levels 5 - 9

Programs Instruction in English to speakers of
other languages. (Includes students of
all ethnic backgrounds.)

Number of Personnel 9 Teachers

Other _____

Other - Board of EdLang. Dev. & Rem. Read. Program

Applied to Grade Levels Elem. and High School

Programs Reading Language Development
and Remedial Reading.

Number of Personnel 2 Teachers

Other _____

Applied To Grade Levels _____

Programs _____

Number of Personnel _____

Other _____

APPENDIX B

BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBER

SURVEY FORM

PROBLEM

Societal changes and new demands upon educational systems require educators and Board of Education members to consider and develop new ways of restructuring aspects of school organization to provide more effective and efficient educational programming. The problem remains ... How best to organize to provide socially responsive systems and programs to help insure quality education that recognizes individual student needs.

Opposing views are supported by detail studies. (E.g., GAO, December 12, 1975, "Assessment of Reading Activities Funded Under the Federal Program (Title I) of Aid For Educationally Deprived Children," and ETS, January 1977, "Examination of Various Program Patterns and Reading Achievement Gains of Students Receiving Compensatory Services in School Districts.") One study concludes that the programs are ineffective and not cost effective; while the other concludes that students are achieving and some cost differences did exist, but were not significantly different from non-title programs.

Your opinions on these questions are being solicited as part of a study being conducted by the Central New Jersey Urban Schools Improvement Council as they examine the status of categorical aid in three areas: (1) E.S.E.A. Title I; (2) Title VII, Bi-Lingual; and (3) Compensatory Ed. Funding.

Please take a few minutes to respond to the questions that follow on the next pages. Your assistance in this most important effort is greatly appreciated.

BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS SURVEY

1. In your opinion, are the current Federal and State guidelines and regulations clearly worded to allow for proper program implementation of the categorical-aid funding sources previously referenced?

_____ Yes _____ No

If you check No, please briefly state your concerns regarding how the guidelines and regulations are written.

2. In your opinion, should there be uniform evaluative systems/designs for Federally and/or State funded categorical aid programs?

_____ Yes _____ No

Comments: _____

3. What recommendations would you project for improving the needs assessment process for student identification and student selection for categorically-funded programs?

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

d. _____

4. In your opinion, is there serious duplication of services within the program designs of categorically-funded programs?

_____ Yes _____ No

If you check Yes, please briefly state your recommendations for correcting this aspect of program planning.

5. In your opinion, is there a managerial need for Directors and/or administrative personnel for each funded program?

_____ Yes _____ No

If you check No, please state briefly your recommendations for a different management design? _____

6. In your opinion, are the program objectives and purposes stated in a manner that allows for measurement of student achievement and program impact?

_____ Yes _____ No

Comments: _____

7. If you were to recommend a change in your district's current management system, which of the following management systems would you propose?

- a. _____ MBO (Management By Objectives)
- b. _____ Zero Based Budgeting System
- c. _____ PPBS (Program, Planning, Budgeting System)
- d. _____ Other

8. If the position is not currently in your system, would you favor creating a position of "Director of Funded Programs" who would administer and/or coordinate all categorically-funded programs in your district?

_____ Yes _____ No

Comments: _____

9. Has your Board been required to create new Board policies to facilitate categorically-funded programs to avoid non-compliance or conflict with Federal and/or State regulations?

_____ Yes _____ No

Comments: _____

10. In your opinion, are the categorically-funded programs in your district "Cost Effective"?

_____ Yes _____ No

Comments: _____

INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF SURVEY FORM

C.N.J.U.S.I.C./1977
CATEGORICAL AID STUDY

SURVEY OF INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

As a Staff Member, you probably have formulated several opinions regarding program effectiveness and student performance in relation to your district's categorically-funded programs (i.e., Title I, Title VII, and/or Compensatory Ed.). Those opinions will be most helpful to the Central New Jersey Urban Schools Improvement Council's research efforts in assessing the impact of categorically-funded programs. Please take a few minutes to answer the questions that follow on the next pages. Your assistance is greatly appreciated. Your comments are confidential and will not require identifying the individual respondents.

1. How many years have you taught?

a. ☐ 1 year

c. ☐ 5 - 7 years

b. ☐ 2 - 4 years

d. ☐ More than 7 years

2. What is your highest academic status? (Check only one)

a. ☐ B.A./B.S. Degree

b. ☐ B.A./B.S. Degree + 30 credits

c. ☐ M.A. Degree

d. ☐ M.A. Degree + 30 credits

e. ☐ Doctorate Degree

3. How many years have you taught in your current position?

a. ☐ 1 year

c. ☐ 5 - 7 years

b. ☐ 2 - 4 years

d. ☐ More than 7 years

4. What content area are you currently assigned to?

a. ☐ Bi-Lingual/NSE Instruction

c. ☐ Computational (Math)

b. ☐ Reading

d. ☐ Other

5. How many students do you instruct during a scheduled instructional period?

a. ☐ 2 - 5 or less

c. ☐ 11 - 20

b. ☐ 6 - 10

d. ☐ Over 20

6. Do you plan for student instruction cooperatively with Title Program Instructional Staff?

☐ Yes ☐ No

(If you check No, please explain.) _____

7. Does the Program Administrator provide for adequate involvement of Instructional Staff in program planning, student selection, and/or program changes?

☐ Yes ☐ No

8. In your opinion, does the Program Administrator provide the Instructional Staff with complete program data, instructions on program implementation, and related program information on a regularly scheduled basis?

_____ Yes _____ No

Comments: _____

9. In your opinion, are students achieving in the skill areas projected to be developed or corrected through the particular fund programs in which your students participate?

_____ Yes _____ No

Comments: _____

10. In your opinion, does the program design allow for adequate instructional time for program objectives to be attained and students to receive needed assistance from staff?

_____ Yes _____ No

Comments: _____

11. What suggestions and/or recommendations, if any, would you propose to improve program effectiveness of categorically-funded programs in your district?

a. _____
b. _____
c. _____
d. _____
e. _____
f. _____

12. In your opinion, would the following statement apply to your district's categorically-funded programs? "...The more funds expended in categorically-funded programs, the less students appear to achieve."

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Possibly

Please comment on your response if you checked No or Possibly.

APPENDIX C

(Responses)

	<u>Number of Responses</u>
Profile of Districts	6 out of possible 7
Board of Education Members Survey	9 out of possible 56
Administrators' Surveys	14 out of possible 21
Instructional Staff Surveys	52 out of possible 70
Evaluations of E.S.E.A. Title I Programs: 1975-1976 1976-1977	8 out of possible 14

APPENDIX D

SUGGESTIONS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS PROPOSED TO
IMPROVE PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS OF CATEGORICALLY-
FUNDED PROGRAMS IN URBAN DISTRICTS.

Instructional Staff

Board of Education Members

Administrators

SUGGESTIONS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS PROPOSED TO IMPROVE PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS
OF CATECHETICALLY-FUNDED PROGRAMS IN DISTRICTS. (Information compiled from
"Instructional Staff Survey Form.") October 1977.

CLASSROOM IMPROVEMENTS

1. Longer classroom periods.
2. Less craft activities and more learning activities.
3. Adequate physical facilities.
4. Students should remain within their room. Have staff of these programs brought into the classroom; ratio of teacher/children better.

COMMUNICATION/SUPERVISION

1. Better communication between parents/teachers. Periodical reporting to parents.
2. " " " teachers/title teachers/administrators.
3. State/local goals. More cohesiveness.
4. Program/staff. Communication among funded-programs and regular-programs instructors.
5. Grouping title teachers' students according to homeroom teachers' reading groups in order to prevent sporadic pullouts of students from homerooms.
6. Better supervision of teachers and what they do. More supervision of title teachers.
7. Communiques from administrator provide program data, achievements, related information sent to all related subject area teachers, not just those people immediately involved.
8. Commitment of administration to criteria and operational requirements of programs.
9. Decision makers attending all sessions which staff attends.
10. Continuity of staff.
11. Scheduled meetings of program instructors with classroom teachers and principal (perhaps bi-monthly) to evaluate meeting objectives, etc.

EVALUATION

1. Improved evaluation design.
2. After implementation of programs, (Federal and otherwise), evaluate the success.
3. Quicker evaluation of students so that instructional process begins sooner.
4. (See #11 above)
5. Practicality of programs should be a major concern.
6. More time for evaluation.

PAPERWORK

1. Unnecessary duplication of paperwork.
2. More teaching. Less paperwork.
3. Less emphasis on record keeping; better record-keeping system.

PROGRAM/NEEDS

1. Identify the districts' needs.
2. Clearly defined instructional and program objectives.
3. Develop programs that will promote success.
4. Funding monies to be spent for purpose for which they were provided; e.g., to employ well-trained staff to work with eligible youngsters.
5. Better scheduling process.
6. Better program planning at the beginning of the year.
7. Planning time for compensatory education teachers to meet with regular teachers to discuss goals, plans, problems.
8. Provide periods to evaluate programs on a regular basis.
9. Planning as suggested in these pilot staff work sessions.
10. Categorically-funded programs must be coordinated with the classroom objectives.
11. Practicality of programs should be a major concern.
12. Programs should start slowly - with pilots - rather than everyone at one time.

PUPIL SELECTION

1. Tests.
2. Teacher recommendation.
3. Need to receive specific instruction.
4. Program should include all children two or more years below grade level.
5. Desire and ability to learn should be considered part of the criteria for pupil selection.
6. Better pupil selection methods; specifically, (a) tests (b) teacher recommendations (c) need of the students to receive that specific kind of instruction.

SCHEDULING AND REMEDIAL/SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTION

1. See #6 under "Program Needs."
2. More teacher input.
3. Scheduled-prepared periods for classroom teachers and programmers.
4. Testing to be scheduled during first 3-weeks of school only.
5. Children should be scheduled for these classes at time when they are not scheduled for other classroom instruction.
6. Amount of time spent in each class should depend on the number of children requiring remediation.
7. Improve and simplify diagnostic procedures.
8. Teachers should have freedom in placing students who need help over some pre-selected ones from previous year.
9. Less short-period remedial programs.
10. More concentrated help. Two or three complete mornings would be more profitable than 1/2 hr. per day.
11. No real continuity between skill areas being taught and classroom teachers program. Is pulling child out of the classroom for 30-40 minutes of "remedial work" really the answer?

SUPPLIES/MATERIALS

1. More readily available materials should be acquired to supplement existing programs especially in reading word problems in the computation area.
2. More material available to supplement programs for specific problems.
3. Less variety in terms of materials.
4. More materials/supplies.
5. Teach the teachers more effective use of materials.

TEACHING

1. Provide staff training for those involved in program.
2. More inservice training - training workshops.
3. More on-going inservice for teachers.
4. Employ people with more knowledge in various programs. Qualified staff/formal preparation and ongoing training
5. Less testing - more teaching.
6. Less paperwork - more teaching.
7. More student/teacher contact.
8. More planning time.
9. Teacher input in selection of students other than assessment forms.
10. Have Title teachers work with Regular teachers.
11. Lengthen time for students.
12. Proper student/teacher ratio.
13. Teachers should concentrate on "catch up."
14. Teachers concerned should have more input in scheduling.
15. Report of objectives and student progress communicated to parents periodically.
16. Perhaps face-to-face communication with parents.
17. Increased staff eliminating delay in children entering the programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Board of Education

1. Earlier test scores and records.
2. Teachers who can identify with needs assessment of students.
3. Duplication regulations done away with.
4. District-wide goals by grade level with exams.
5. Established minimum requirements for promotion.
6. Disregard socio-economic background.
7. Upgrade income requirements.
8. Mix various income groups in programs.
9. More coordination between programs.
10. Test all students.
11. Government recommended agencies to do testing.

Administrators

1. For VII Bilingual develop a more realistic screening instrument.
2. Place greater weight on teacher judgment.
3. Use annual Spring test as a pre- and post- to cut paperwork.
4. Use categorical dollars and staff to test all students in district.
5. Have state assessment instrument, but local standards, norms and criteria.
6. Clearly define Comp. Ed. population.
7. No single "right way."
8. Common instrument, uniform report for all programs.
9. Single process to provide services to students.
10. Less emphasis on norm referenced tests.

BLOCKS TO DISTRICT EFFECTIVE PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION
OF CATEGORICALLY-FUNDED PROGRAMS

Administrators

1. Separate efforts - LEA vs. SCE.
2. Classroom teacher with limited remedial background.
3. Lack of integration with regular school program.
4. Lack of classroom teacher understanding.
5. Lack of support of building principals.
6. Lack of adequate resources.
7. Lack of parental and community support.
8. Lack of coordination due to differing guidelines.
9. Notification and approval of Title I allocations.
10. Lack of proper instructional space.
11. No guidelines to resolve disputes (principals/program administrators).